(V) 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

(CHHATTISGARH)

WRIT PETITION NO. 2808 OF 2006 SINGLE BENCH

PETITIONER : J. S. Gaikwad Son of Shri Dharmuram Gaikwad, aged about 60 yeas, Suspended Deputy Registrar, presently residing at Durg, District Durg (C.G.).

P.H. No. 2880/06
Presented by Shri V.K. Pandey
dated 14/6/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Secretary, Department of Commercial Tax, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.).

2. The Inspector General, Registration, Raipur (C.G.).

3. The District Registrar, Durg, (C.G.).

BILASPUR
14/6/06

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION ETC.

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक WP No. 2808/06 **सन् 200**

(46)

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

16.6.2006:-

Shri V.K. Pandey, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the State/ respondents.

Heard both the counsel.

The main grievance raised by the petitioner in this petition is that while he was working as Deputy Registrar, he was suspended on account of a criminal case instituted against him under Sections 120-B, 420 and 471 of the IPC read with Sections 13 (1)(d)/13 (2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and later on, he was acquitted in the said case by the trial Court vide Annexure-P/2 on 24-9-2005. Thereafter, the petitioner moved a representation Annexure-P/3 for reinstatement and other benefits but so far nothing has been done.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that after acquittal the petitioner submitted a representation but the respondents authorities are not passing any order regarding reinstatement of the petitioner and no enquiry is contemplated against the petitioner, even then the suspension order is not being revoked. Learned counsel further submitted that representation has already been made to respondents No.2 and 3 but no order is being passed, therefore, respondent No.2 be directed to decide representation of the petitioner to which learned counsel for respondents has no objection.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner is just, fair and reasonable, therefore, respondent No.2 is directed to decide representation of the petitioner within a period of 30 days from today, in accordance with law.

With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C. Bhadoo
Judge

Babul